We would like to thank the referees for reviewing our manuscript and for their helpful comments and suggestions. Our point-by-point responses are given below. Page and line numbers given refer to the reviewed version of the manuscript. The original reviewer comments are typeset in gray, the replies in black, while the proposed changes in the text are in blue.

Anonymous Referee #1

1) My only concern with the manuscript, at present, is the detrimental effect of the current length and breadth of the present manuscript on the overall readability and, possibly, even limiting further discussion of both (1) the data collection and (2) the data comparison with global and regional models. The manuscript would appear to be well-suited for division into two companion manuscripts, with one containing the description and comparison of the instrumentation and observational data, and a second manuscript containing the measurement-model discussion.

We agree that in principle the scope and findings of the manuscript could be separated into two companion publications, and we discussed this when starting on the manuscript. However, we concluded that the combination of the new high resolution CH₄ isotope data with the data interpretation using models in one manuscript is in fact one of the strengths of our work, and we therefore decided to keep these two aspects together in order to increase the impact of the work.

2) It appears as though the TREX-QCLAS collected only half as many measurements as the IRMS system (Fig. 2). Is there cause for concern regarding reliability, despite a moderate increase in throughput? I commend the authors for their discussion of the inter-calibration and comparison of the two measurement techniques, both with regards to isotopic and mole fraction measurements.

Both analytical systems were newly developed and for the first time applied in an extended field campaign, and there are periods without data, indeed more so for the QCLAS system than for the IRMS system, which is partly due to the fact that high quality measurements with the QCLAS system started later. The authors are convinced that there is no fundamental cause for concern regarding the TREX-QCLAS system as demonstrated by a significantly improved performance by the end of the campaign as mentioned in the method section on page 10 Line 283 – 289. Similar instrumentation developed by the authors has been applied for extended field campaigns (e.g. Wolf et al. Biogeosciences, 2015). The fact that the TREX-QCLAS system started later and that various kind of instrument malfunctions led to a number of interruptions for both analytical systems is mentioned in the result section of the manuscript on page 14 Line 417 – 422.

Specific comments:

3) Line 89: This is a poor topic sentence for this paragraph. This paragraph should be re-structured.

The respective sentence was moved to page 4 Line 97, after the wording: … and given in per mill (‰). CH₄ mole fractions …

4) Line 163 and elsewhere: Manufacturers need additional location information (e.g. line 163, Varian, Inc.) and sufficient information is missing for some manufacturers (e.g. VICI, manufacturer of Valco valves).

The following information was added:
Line 163: … by a Varian scroll pump (Agilent Technologies Inc., USA)
Line 178: … Thermo Delta Plus XP for carbon isotopes, both Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., Germany)
Line 187: … using removable frits (CEF1F, Valco Instruments Company Inc., USA)
Line 189: … with Valco fittings (ECEF211.0F, Valco Instruments Company Inc., USA).
Line 202: … directed either Helium (He, BIP quality, Air Products and Chemicals Inc., USA) or …
Line 204: … by mass flow controllers (MFC, MKS Instruments Inc., USA).
Line 210: … by a mini pump (P200-GAS-12V, Xavitech AB, Sweden).
Line 241: A custom made LabVIEW software program (National Instruments Corp., USA) was …
5) Line 134: A summary of the contents of each section seems self-explanatory and does not add value to the manuscript.

The respective section was shortened to:

... and one QCLAS-instrument developed at Empa. The compatibility of both analytical techniques for CH₄ mole fractions, δ¹³C-CH₄ and δD-CH₄ is assessed and the obtained high-resolution isotope dataset is exploited using a novel moving Keeling plot method. Comparison of measurement results with calculations from two different models (TM5 and FLEXPART-COSMO) and two inventories (EDGAR, TNO-MACC) indicates the potential of this approach to better constrain on isotope source signatures and emissions in atmospheric models.

6) Lines 196-205: Are the valve abbreviations used for descriptive purposes or are they part numbers? If they are for descriptive purposes, it would be great if they also appeared in Fig. 1.

Figure 1 has been updated accordingly.

7) Line 191: the authors have described two traps, one for pre-concentration (“PreCon”) and a second for focusing (“Focus”). Please replace “focus units” with “trapping units” or something similar.

The respective sentence was changed to:

The PreCon and Focus trapping units were glued together with a PT-100 temperature sensor in heat-conducting two component epoxy on a brass standoff.

8) Line 222: capitalize “plus”

The actual IRMS product names from Thermo Fisher do not use capitals: Delta plus XL or Delta plus XP

9) Line 232: In Fig. 1, the temperature for the PoraPLOT Q is listed as 0 °C, not 5°C. Please clarify.

The correct temperature is 5°C, this was updated in figure 1.

10) Lines 227-228 and 234: repeatability estimate needs +/-; is the estimate reported as SD or SE?

The ± sign has been added and the estimate is reported as SD (also added).

11) Line 237: “base” should be “basis”

Done

12) Line 238: please define “target gas”

We have added the following sentence:

... was analyzed as a quality control tool in order to monitor the long term stability of the analytical technique.

13) Line 245-257: would units of umol/mol not be better considering the magnitude of the concentration, as well and bringing uniformity to the units reported for the laser reference gases?

The authors prefer to keep the units for CH₄ mole fractions in the reference air cylinder in nmol/mol, which is a common unit for close to ambient CH₄ mole fractions and also used in Figures 2 – 5 and Figure 9.
14) Line 253: I think something is confused here. I believe the authors intend to report no significant linearity, however, as worded ("no non-linearity"), the opposite is conveyed. If there was significant linearity, please report the change in isotopic value with concentration.

This confusion arose from the somewhat unconventional use of the term "non-linearity" in isotope research. The sentence has been clarified as follows:

The linear response of the analytical system (independence of the δ value on the amount of CH₄ analyzed) was verified by injecting various volumes of reference air up to a volume equivalent to 2700 nmol/mol.

15) Line 276: A direct comparison of the throughput between systems would be helpful earlier in the manuscript. It is referenced later, but I was already wondering about the comparison at first presentation.

The authors agree and added the following sentence:

This translates into an analysis time of 54 minutes per sample of ambient or pressurized air.

16) Line 333: remove “see” in brackets.

Done.

17) Lines 334-336: How were these source signatures “adjusted”? Please expand.

The sentence was misleading and has been modified as follows (see comment 10 from referee 2).

The emission inventory was built according to a double constraint: 1st, each source signature must be chosen within its own uncertainty interval, and 2nd, the resulting global average source signature must be compatible with the global source signature that is inferred from the observations (and that is known with a much better precision than the individual source signatures).

18) Line 358: “Denmark, and Poland”

Done.


For δ¹³C-CH₄ only a slight offset between TREX-QCLAS and IRMS results of 0.05 ± 0.03 ‰ was observed. TREX-QCLAS results for δD-CH₄ during the Cabauw campaign were on average -3.6 ± 0.4 ‰ lower than values obtained by IRMS and discrepancies were most pronounced for low δD-CH₄ values. Differences for δD-CH₄ between both techniques are irrespective of the fact, that recently a link was established between the CH₄ isotopic composition and the international reference materials VPDB and VSMOW, in the framework of the INGOS project (Sperlich et al., 2016) and both laboratories already performed inter-laboratory measurements in a previous campaign as published by Eyer et al. (2016). The enhanced discrepancies for low δD-CH₄ values might be explained by a non-linear response of one of the applied techniques. To present the above argumentation the following wording was added to page 16 Line 463:

… as indicated by the red dashed lines (WMO, 2014). Individual measurement pairs, however, can show significantly larger deviations for aforementioned reasons. Differences for δD-CH₄ between both techniques are higher than expected as both laboratories refer their measurements to MPI-BGC, who recently established a link between the CH₄ isotopic composition and the international reference materials VPDB and VSMOW, in the framework of the INGOS project (Sperlich et al., 2016). Therefore, remaining differences can only be rationalized by uncertainties in propagating the scale or by instrumental issues. The enhanced discrepancies for low δD-CH₄ values might originate from a non-linear response of one of the applied analytical techniques. The mean offset …

20) Fig. 1. Labeling of valves and matching description in text would be helpful.

Done. See also response on comment #6 of reviewer #1.
We would like to thank the referees for reviewing our manuscript and for their helpful comments and suggestions. Our point-by-point responses are given below. Page and line numbers given refer to the reviewed version of the manuscript. The original reviewer comments are typeset in gray, the replies in black, while the proposed changes in the text are in blue.

**Anonymous Referee #2**

1) Bag samples from the Royal Holloway University of London laboratory are presented in Figure 2, but not referenced anywhere that I can find in the main text. I think these measurements should either be discussed in the body of the manuscript, or removed from Figure 2.

The IRMS data from RHUL were removed from Figure 2 in order to not further increase the complexity and length of the manuscript.

2) I don’t know if this is a convention in the literature, but my understanding of the nomenclature used in this paper is that “isotopic signature” is used to describe the isotope ratio of the CH4 emitted from a particular source, whereas “isotope source signature” or just “source signature” is used to describe the combined isotopic signature of the sources that might have contributed to a measured air mass. I found this a very confusing (e.g. see L378 - 380), and perhaps not the most descriptive set of terms. Perhaps I am confused, but I wonder whether the authors could come up with a naming system that describes these terms more clearly. Mainly, when I read the term “source signature” I think that it must refer to the delta value that is the property of a particular source. This does not seem to be its use in this paper.

The terms “isotopic signature” and “isotopic source signature” were used to describe both the isotopic composition of a “single process” CH4 source and a “combined or mixed source”, which may indeed lead to confusion. To resolve this, signatures of combined or mixed sources are now referred to as “mean isotopic signature” or “isotopic composition”. To clarify the wording the following section on page 13 Line 383 – 391 was rephrased:

The isotopic composition of CH4 emissions were estimated using the Keeling plot technique (Keeling, 1961; Pataki et al., 2003). This method allows determining the isotopic signature of a single source process or the mean isotopic signature of combined source processes that mix into a background reservoir from the observed ambient isotopic composition and mole fraction. An implicit assumption of the Keeling plot approach is that the isotopic composition and mole fraction of the background reservoir and the isotopic composition of the source or the combined source stay constant over the time range of the analysis. This may not always apply as the relative contribution of individual CH4 sources or their isotopic signature may change over time.

In addition, the terms “isotopic source signature” and “isotopic signature” were replaced on

- Page 13 Line 379: “isotopic source signatures” replaced by “mean δ13C and δD isotopic signatures”
- Page 18 Line 526: “source signatures” replaced by “mean δD signature”
- Page 18 Line 549: “isotopic signature” replaced by “mean isotopic signatures”
- Page 18 Line 552: “isotopic signatures” replaced by “mean isotopic signatures”
- Page 18 Line 554: “isotopic signature” replaced by “mean isotopic signature”
- Page 19 Line 556: “cumulative source signature” replaced by “mean isotopic signature”
- Page 19 Line 560: “source signature” replaced by “mean isotopic signature”
- Page 19 Line 571: “δ13C source signatures” replaced by “mean δ13C signatures”
- Page 19 Line 572: “δD source signatures” replaced by “mean δ13D signatures”
- Page 19 Line 575: “δ13C and δD source signatures” replaced by “mean δ13C and δD signatures”
- Page 19 Line 577: “source signatures” replaced by “mean isotopic signature”
- Page 19 Line 582: “isotopic source signatures” replaced by “mean isotopic signature”
- Page 20 Line 589: “isotope source signature” replaced by “mean isotopic signature”
- Page 20 Line 595: “source signature” replaced by “signature”
Furthermore the title of section 4.2 was changed to:
Isotope identification of the mean CH₄ source

Specific comments:
3) L51: “representative of”
The wording “…at multiple sites that are representative for the entire European domain.” seems to be appropriate.

4) L94: Shouldn’t this be “Pee Dee Belemnite”?
Done

5) L159: What does “limited air conditioning mean”?
Wording preplaced by:
Since this room is not commonly used as laboratory, it has an air-conditioning with limited cooling capacity and …

6) L162: Define “o.d” in this section.
Done

7) L271: “a lower offset in d13C of 1.58permil”. I think this statement would benefit from spelling out a little more clearly. What was the offset before, and how has it changed?
The reasoning for the lower offset was already given in the text a few lines before. To clarify the issue and to add details on the offset during previous measurements the text on page 9 Line 268 ff was changed too:

Due to the lower heating power, the duration of the desorption step had to be extended, which led to an improved separation from residual bulk gases (e.g. N₂ and O₂). Lowering the O₂ enhancement in the gas matrix is also the main reason for a lower offset in δ¹³C of 1.58 ‰, with respect to the MPI-scale, as compared to 2.3 ‰ in previously published results (Eyer et al., 2015).

8) L286 - 288: What adjustments were made? Can you provide general details?

The following information has been added on page 10 Line 286:

Additional adjustments in the preconcentration procedure and in the analytical routine for isotope analysis improved the repeatability to 0.18 ‰ and 0.85 ‰ for δ¹³C and δD in the last month of the campaign. One example is the improved temperature control of the trap during adsorption, which in turn stabilized the O₂ content in the measuring gas and thereby reduced variations in δ¹³C-CH₄.

9) L318: ERA interim

Done

10) L334: I presume this is following some spin up period? Are the delta-values at ~ steady state before the model run?

We did a long (20 years) spinup run for the year 2005. The atmospheric CH₄ growth rate had been stable for a few years then and thus it can be assumed that the atmosphere was relatively close to equilibrium with the emissions. We used this spinup as a starting point for our simulations, which cover the period 2005-2015. This way the imbalance of the atmospheric CH₄ and δ¹³C-CH₄ in 2014 should be reasonably accounted for. The paragraph was modified accordingly as follows.

... source signatures (see Table 1). The emission inventory was built according to a double constraint: 1st, each source signature must be chosen within its own uncertainty interval, and 2nd, the resulting global average source signature must be compatible with the global source signature that is inferred from the observations (and that is known with a much better precision than the individual source signatures). In a second set of simulations, anthropogenic emissions in a regional domain centered on Cabauw were replaced by emissions from the European TNO-MACC_2 inventory, which was used as the standard inventory in the PLEXPART-COSMO simulations (see below). Outside the regional domain covered by TNO-MACC_2, the EDGAR emissions were used.

Atmospheric removal of CH₄ was modeled as described in Monteil et al. (2013), using kinetic fractionation factors α = k(¹²C)/k(¹³C) of αOH = 1.0055, αCI = 1.0066 and αOH(¹D) = 1.013 for the reactions between CH₄ and OH (Sander et al., 2006), CI (Saueressig et al., 1995) and O(¹D) (Saueressig et al., 2000), respectively. The simulations were initialized at steady state (obtained via a spin-up run) in 2005, and simulations of the period 2005-2015 were used to calculate a realistic state of the atmosphere at the start of the measurement campaigns, including the imbalance between emissions and atmospheric CH₄ mixing ratio/isotopic composition in 2014. Time series were extracted from model-simulated mole fraction fields after interpolation to the horizontal coordinate and height of the Cabauw tower air inlet.

11) L369: This sentence is a little confusing and doesn’t quite follow from the previous one. What was "done separately" for the SNAP categories?

To clarify this, the sentence on page 13 Line 369 was replaced by:

Methane mole fractions were computed separately for a number of SNAP (Standardized Nomenclature for Air Pollutants) source categories with specific isotopic signatures as summarized in Table 2.

12) L385: "This method allows ... to be determined"

Done
13) L429: I don’t think "Inter-calibration" is the correct term here. I think you mean "Inter-comparison"? This section doesn’t describe a calibration exercise.

Done

14) L466 and Figure 3: It looks to me like there is some non-linearity in the comparison between the two instruments for delta-D? The values at the lower end of the scale appear to be significantly lower for the TREX-QCLAS. Is this true? E.g. if a 2nd order polynomial were fit, it looks to me like it would come out with some curvature. I think this deserves a comment.

The response to this comment has been combined with the response to comment #19 of reviewer #1.

15) L498 - 499: TM5 does indeed seem to perform very well. However, I think this line is somewhat subjective (e.g. use of the term “remarkable”) and should be removed.

Done

16) L508: I’m a little unclear what this line means. Do you mean simply that this offset is seen globally?

Yes, at least it is present in the whole Northern Hemisphere.

… offset by about 1 ‰, but this offset is also present at clean background sites in the Northern hemisphere.

17) L520: “showed, that” … I don’t think the comma is needed.

Done

18) L569 and Figure 7: I’m a little concerned about the points in Figure 7. My understanding of the MKP is that it is an hourly “running” 12-hour Keeling plot. Each point in Figure 7 is then the 6-hourly average of the “12-hour running intercepts”. Therefore, it seems to me that what we’re seeing at each point is a doubly smoothed estimate of the source signature during some ~ 18-hour period. Wouldn’t this analysis be more transparent if a “normal” Keeling plot were calculated during a block 6 or 12-hour period? Otherwise it becomes more difficult to understand what these points really show and what time period they correspond to.

The reason for the additional 6-hour averaging is that in some cases the time periods of the MKP for $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D are not identical, e.g. because of instrument failure or because of the data filtering procedures. To increase the number of pairs of MKP intercepts the additional 6-hour averaging was added.

19) L644 - 645: delete “even”

Done

20) L654: This is a good example of where the term “source signatures” is confusing. I’m not sure whether you’re referring to the particular isotopic ratio of the methane emitted from a source, or of something about the bulk source mix that you’ve inferred from the air mass.

This has been updated accordingly, see response to comment #2.

21) Figure 7: At the point where this Figure appears and is referenced, it’s not clear what the “a” and “b” refer to in the event labels. I think the Figure caption should be expanded to explain when these events were.

The color coding, numbering and characters (a, b) of event labels of Figure 7 refer to Figure 9 as mentioned in the legend. In Figure 9 more details on the events are given. Nonetheless the additional information has also been added to Figure 7:

… Large colored symbols indicate data from the three events (event 1: 10th – 12th March, event 2: 16th – 18th March, event 3: 22nd to 24th March) that are highlighted in detail in Fig. 9. The labels a and b refer to day 1 and day 2 of the two-day events, respectively.
22) Figure 7: I think these points should have error bars. 

Error bars have been added.

23) Figure 7: The reference to Rigby et al. (2012). The original “mean” values are from Snover et al. (2000), which I think should be cited. The ranges are those assumed (somewhat arbitrarily) for the inversion in Rigby et al (2012).

The reference of Snover et al. (2000) was added to the legend of Figure 7:

... from recent literature (Snover et al., 2000; Rigby et al., 2012)
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Abstract

High precision analyses of the isotopic composition of methane in ambient air can potentially be used to discriminate between different source categories. Due to the complexity of isotope ratio measurements, such analyses have generally been performed in the laboratory on air samples collected in the field. This poses a limitation on the temporal resolution at which the isotopic composition can be monitored with reasonable logistical effort. Here we present the performance of a dual isotope ratio mass spectrometric system (IRMS) and a quantum cascade laser absorption spectroscopy (QCLAS) based technique for in-situ analysis of the isotopic composition of methane under field conditions. Both systems were deployed at the Cabauw experimental site for atmospheric research (CESAR) in the Netherlands and performed in-situ, high-frequency (approx. hourly) measurements for a period of more than 5 months. The IRMS and QCLAS instruments were in excellent agreement with a slight systematic offset of (+0.25 ± 0.04) ‰ for δ¹³C and (-4.3 ± 0.4) ‰ for δD. This was corrected for, yielding a combined dataset with more than 2500 measurements of both δ¹³C and δD. The high precision and temporal resolution dataset does not only reveal the overwhelming contribution of isotopically depleted agricultural CH₄ emissions from ruminants at the Cabauw site, but also allows the identification of specific events with elevated contributions from more enriched sources such as natural gas and landfills. The final dataset was compared to model calculations using the global model TM5 and the mesoscale model FLEXPART-COSMO. The results of both models agree better with the measurements when the TNO-MACC emission inventory is used in the models than when the EDGAR inventory is used. This suggests that high-resolution isotope measurements have the potential to further constrain the methane budget, when they are performed at multiple sites that are representative for the entire European domain.
1. Introduction

The global increase of the important greenhouse gas methane in the atmosphere since the beginning of the industrial period is very well established (Dlugokencky et al., 2009; Dlugokencky et al., 1996; Dlugokencky et al., 1998; Etheridge et al., 1998; Khalil et al., 2007; Loulergue et al., 2008; MacFarling Meure et al., 2006; Rasmussen and Khalil, 1981; Spahni et al., 2005). The existing CH$_4$ mole fraction measurement data enable accurate assessment of the source-sink imbalance through time, and together with the estimated total sink strength, they allow for a top-down constraint on the global source of methane to the atmosphere (Bergamaschi et al., 2013; Houweling et al., 2014). Bottom-up estimates of the global methane budget carry much larger uncertainties, which are inherent to the assumptions made in the extrapolation of local scale measurements to larger scales (Bruhwiler et al., 2014; Kirschke et al., 2013; Nisbet et al., 2014). The advantage of bottom-up estimates is, however, the possibility to distinguish different sources and to link observations to process-level understanding of the emissions.

An independent approach for distinguishing between source categories of CH$_4$ is the analysis of its isotopic composition, which is strongly linked to the source/sink processes. This is particularly true for methane from biogenic, thermogenic and pyrogenic sources (Gros et al., 2004; Houweling et al., 2008; Quay et al., 1999; Sapart et al., 2012). A more detailed differentiation within one source category, e.g. biogenic CH$_4$, for emissions from wetlands, ruminants, rice paddies or termites, however, is complicated because of the overlap of the respective isotopic source signatures. Further complications arise because individual source signatures can show pronounced dependence on environmental parameters and metabolized substrates (Kawagucci et al., 2014; Klevenhusen et al., 2010). In addition to the source contributions, the sink processes (mainly chemical removal by the hydroxyl radical (OH), but also soil deposition and stratospheric loss) also affect the isotopic composition of atmospheric methane (Brenninkmeijer et al., 1995; Röckmann et al., 2011; Saueressig et al., 1996; Saueressig et al., 2001; Snover and Quay, 2000).

Nevertheless, over the past decades, numerous studies have shown the potential of isotope measurements to identify individual source categories from isotope
The isotopic composition is commonly reported in δ notation, where δ quantifies the relative deviation of an isotope ratio \( ^{13}R = \frac{^{13}C}{^{12}C} \) for carbon isotopes and \( ^{2}R = \frac{^{2}H}{^{1}H} \), abbreviated as D/H, for hydrogen isotopes) in a sample from a standard ratio. The international standard for reporting δ\(^{13}\)C, CH\(_{4}\) values is Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (VPDB, \( ^{13}R_{VPDB} = 0.0112372 \) (Craig, 1957)) and for δ(D, CH\(_{4}\)) it is Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (VSMOW, \( ^{2}R_{VSMOW} = 0.0020052 \) (Baertschi, 1976)). δ\(^{13}\)C, CH\(_{4}\) and δ(D, CH\(_{4}\)) are abbreviated as δ\(^{13}\)C and δD in the following, and given in per mill (%o). CH\(_{4}\) mole fractions \( \chi(\text{CH}_4) \) are reported in nmol/mol = \( 10^{-9} \) and µmol/mol = \( 10^{-6} \). For interpretation of global or continental scale atmospheric data the expert group of the WMO/IAEA has set a scientifically desirable level of compatibility of 2 nmol/mol, 0.02 %o and 1 %o for CH\(_{4}\) fraction, δ\(^{13}\)C and δD, respectively (WMO, 2014). For regionally focused studies with large local fluxes, extended compatibility goals of 5 nmol/mol, 0.2 %o and 5 %o for \( \chi(\text{CH}_4) \), δ\(^{13}\)C and δD were defined.

Due to the complexity of the involved measurement techniques, CH\(_{4}\) isotope measurements have been limited mostly to relatively low frequency sampling in the field followed by isotope analysis in the laboratory (Bock et al., 2010; Brass and Röckmann, 2010; Sapart et al., 2011; Sperlich et al., 2013; Umezawa et al., 2009; Yamada et al., 2003). For many decades, the dominant method for high precision isotope analysis of atmospheric methane was isotope ratio mass spectrometry. In particular, the development of continuous-flow IRMS in the past two decades (Merritt et al., 1994; Merritt et al., 1995) has greatly increased the throughput of IRMS methods, making this the technique of choice in most laboratories, also because of the small sample amounts required.

Recently, mid-infrared laser absorption spectroscopy has proven its potential for high precision isotope ratio analysis. First attempts of measuring the isotopic composition of methane (Bergamaschi et al., 1998a; 1998b; 1994) were restricted to enhanced CH\(_{4}\) fractions (>50 µmol/mol for δ\(^{13}\)C and >2000
µmol/mol for δD) and required cryogenic cooling for both the laser source and
the detector, which impeded in-situ and long-term applications. The invention of
room temperature, quantum cascade laser (QCL) sources has triggered the
development of a novel generation of spectrometers suitable for in-situ analysis
of the isotopic composition of greenhouse gases (Eyer and al, 2015; Tuzson et al.,
2008; Wächter et al., 2008). Their capability of high-temporal resolution led to
new applications aiming for source attribution (Mohn et al., 2012; Tuzson et al.,
2011; Wolf et al., 2015). The advantages of in-situ measurements are particularly
apparent in combination with atmospheric modeling techniques, which enables
the identification of specific source regions (Rigby et al., 2012; Sturm et al.,
2013). Similarly, high-frequency, high-precision CH₄ isotope data are expected to
greatly reduce uncertainties of national and global source estimations, as
demonstrated in an observing system simulation experiment (Rigby et al., 2012).

In this paper we present the analytical setup and results of a 5-month campaign
at the Cabauw tall tower site in the Netherlands, where the isotopic composition
(δ¹³C and δD) of CH₄ was measured with two instruments, one IRMS system
developed at Utrecht University and one QCLAS-instrument developed at Empa.

The compatibility of the two analytical techniques for CH₄ mole fractions, δ¹³C-
CH₄ and δD-CH₄ is assessed and the obtained high-resolution isotope dataset is
exploited using a novel moving Keeling plot method. A comparison of
measurement results with calculations from two different models (TM5 and
FLEXPART-COSMO) and two emission inventories (EDGAR, TNO-MACC)
indicates the potential of this approach to better constrain on isotope source
signatures and emissions in atmospheric models.

2. Methods

2.1. Site description

The 213 m tall tower is the central construction of the Cabauw Experimental Site
for Atmospheric Research (CESAR, http://www.cesar-observatory.nl/, 51° 58’ N,
4° 55’ E, 2 m a.s.l.). The CESAR site is dedicated to atmospheric research and
hosts a wide variety of instruments for in situ and remote sensing measurements
of meteorological parameters, trace gases, pollutants, aerosols, and clouds. The
site is located in an agricultural landscape, with CH$_4$ emissions originating from ruminants and other agricultural activities, but also from the peaty soil and the drainage ditches between the surrounding fields (Peltola et al., 2014). The small town Lopik (~7500 inhabitants) is located 1 km east of the tower. Population and road density increase steeply further away from the tower towards the country’s major cities: Utrecht (at about 20 km distance), Rotterdam (30 km), the Hague (40 km) and Amsterdam (45 km). An estimated seven million people inhabit these cities and their many neighboring settlements. The location and surroundings are described in more detail in (Peltola et al., 2014; Peltola et al., 2015; Vermeulen et al., 2011). The instruments were operated in a room on the ground floor of the CESAR building. Since this room is not commonly used as laboratory, it has air-conditioning with limited cooling capacity and the temperature varied between 25 °C and 30 °C.

2.2. Air sampling at the Cabauw tall tower

Air was continuously drawn through $\frac{1}{2}$" o.d. [outer diameter] Dekabon tubing from 20 m height at a total flow of 16 l min$^{-1}$ provided by a Varian scroll pump (Agilent Technologies Inc., USA). The sample gas flow was adjusted by means of a flow restriction at the inlet of the pump in order to maintain the pressure in the sampling line above 950 hPa. The sample gas flows for the methane isotope analyzers were branched off upstream of the scroll pump and the restriction, using $\frac{1}{4}$" o.d. Dekabon lines.

2.3. IRMS system

The new IRMS method for $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D analysis of atmospheric CH$_4$ is based on the ISAAC system as developed at the MPI for Biogeochemistry in Jena (W. Brand et al., manuscript in preparation). Importantly, the system does not require liquid nitrogen coolant for the preconcentration and focusing steps, but uses a massive copper block cooled down to about -145 °C, to which the cold traps for preconcentration and cryo-focussing are connected via standoffs (see 2.3.1). This cold assembly is contained in an evacuated steel Dewar to prevent condensation of moisture. During the campaign, the extraction unit and two IRMS instruments (Thermo Delta Plus XL for hydrogen isotopes and Thermo Delta Plus XP for
carbon isotopes, both Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., Germany) were operated at
the CESAR site. The system is schematically shown in Fig. 1.

2.3.1. Cryogenic trapping
A Polycold compact cooler compressor (Brooks Automation Inc., USA), filled with
coolant PT-30, cooled a cold end on which a copper cylinder (70 mm diameter,
85 mm height, 3 kg) was mounted. In this configuration, the copper block
reached a temperature of -145 °C. The pre-concentration trap (PreCon) was a 10
cm 1/8” SS tube filled with 4 cm 60/80 mesh HayeSep D in the center and 3 cm
60/80 glass beads on each end. It was connected with Valco fittings and the
packing material was retained in the trap using removable frits (CEF1F, Valco
Instruments Company Inc., USA). The focus trap (Focus) was a 10 cm 1/16” SS
tube filled with 2 cm HayeSep D and 4 cm glass beads at both ends, connected
with Valco fittings (ECEF211.0F, Valco Instruments Company Inc., USA). The
traps could be heated with 0.5 m Thermys heating wire wrapped around the
tubes. The PreCon and Focus trapping units were glued together with a PT-100
temperature sensor in heat-conducting two component epoxy on a brass
standoff. These brass standoffs were mounted to the copper cylinder. In the
“trapping” configuration the temperatures of the traps were usually kept at -135
°C.

2.3.2. Measurement procedure
A 3-port 2-position Valco valve (3PV, Fig. 1) selected either ambient air drawn
from the tower through a Mg(ClO$_4$)$_2$ dryer, or cylinder air that was injected via
one port of an 8-port multiposition Valco valve (MPV). To check the system
performance, a reference air cylinder (Ref) was measured alternately with
ambient air, and three other target gas cylinders were measured occasionally.
The inlet line was connected to a 4-port 2-position Valco valve (4PV1), which
directed either Helium (He, BIP quality, Air Products and Chemicals Inc., USA) or
the selected airflow to the PreCon unit, which was connected in the loop position
of a 6-port 2-position Valco valve (6PV). All He and air flows were controlled by
MKS mass flow controllers (MFC, MKS Instruments Inc., USA).
The preconcentration and cryofocussing was done similarly to Brass and
Röckmann (2010). After flushing the inlet line with >20 ml air, the 6PV was
switched to the load position and air was admitted to the PreCon unit. The
duration of the air sampling for the IRMS system was 10 minutes at a flow rate of
5 ml min⁻¹ for δ¹³C and 7 ml min⁻¹ for δD. The flow was provided by a Xavitech
mini pump (P200-GAS-12V, Xavitech AB, Sweden). During this step, the
temperature measured at the PreCon stayed below -132 °C. At this temperature
CH₄ and several other trace species were retained on the HayeSep D, while the
air matrix was efficiently flushed out.

After preconcentration, the PreCon unit was heated to -30 °C and a He flow of
3 ml min⁻¹ transported the CH₄ in 90 seconds to the Focus unit, which was held at
a temperature < -137 °C. After transfer of the sample to the Focus, the 6PV was
switched to the load position and the PreCon was heated to -10 °C to release any
remaining trapped gases such as CO₂.

The Focus was then heated to release the CH₄, which was directed via 4PV2 and
4VP3 either to the combustion oven and the Delta plus XP IRMS for ¹³C analysis
or to the pyrolysis oven and the Delta plus XL IRMS for D analysis.

For δD analysis, the CH₄ was injected into a pyrolysis tube furnace (1400 °C),
where CH₄ was converted to H₂ and carbon. The H₂ entered the IRMS, after
passing a 2 m CarboPLOT column at room temperature (RT) and a naftion dryer,
via the GasBench interface. No krypton interference (Schmitt et al., 2013) could
determine in this setup. The repeatability for δD was generally better than
±2 ‰ (reported as SD), based on consecutive analyses of reference air.

For δ¹³C, the CH₄ was injected from the cryofocus unit into a combustion oven
containing a nickel / nickel oxide wire catalyst at 1100 °C, where the CH₄ was
converted to CO₂ and H₂O. The resulting gas mixture passed a naftion dryer and a
10 m PoraPLOT Q column (5 °C) to eliminate interference from co-trapped
krypton (Schmitt et al., 2013) before entering the IRMS via the GasBench
interface. The repeatability of δ¹³C was better than ±0.07 ‰ (reported as SD),
based on consecutive analyses of reference air.

The typical measurement order during the Cabauw campaign was Ref δ¹³C – Air
δ¹³C – Ref δD – Air δD. A full measurement cycle took 84 min. On a regular basis,
pressurized air from a cylinder, applied as a target gas, was analyzed as a quality
control tool in order to monitor the long term stability of the analytical technique. The CH$_4$ mole fraction and isotopic composition in ambient air and target gas were calculated using an interpolation of the reference air analyzed before and afterwards. A custom made LabView software program (National Instruments Corp., USA) was used to control and log the temperature of the traps, the valve switching and the flow setpoints of the MFCs.

2.3.3. IRMS system isotope calibration

The isotope calibration of the IRMS system was based on a reference air cylinder that contains ambient air collected at the IMAU in 2014, with 1888 nmol/mol of CH$_4$ and isotope values of $\delta^{13}$C = -47.89 ‰ and $\delta^D$ = -88.08 ‰. The isotope calibration scale is based on the reference scale that was described in detail in Brass and Röckmann (2010). We used the average of the reference air measurement before and after the sample air measurement to calculate the mole fraction and $\delta$ values. The linear response of the analytical system (independence of the $\delta$ value on the amount of CH$_4$ analyzed) was verified by injecting various volumes of reference air up to a volume equivalent to 2700 nmol/mol. Occasionally, the long-term stability of the system was checked by measuring 3 target cylinders with different CH$_4$ mole fractions and isotopic compositions. A robust link of the isotopic composition to the international reference materials VPDB and VSMOW has been established in the framework of the INGOS project (Sperlich et al., 2016).

2.4. QCLAS system

The analytical procedure of the laser based measurement system involves two steps: preconcentration of the CH$_4$ from 7.5 L of ambient air in a trace gas extractor (TREX) by adsorption on HayeSep D (Eyer et al., 2014; Mohn et al., 2010) and analysis of CH$_4$ isotopologues with a modified commercial QCLAS (QCL-76-D, Aerodyne Inc., USA). Details on the development, optimization and validation of the TREX-QCLAS system are given by Eyer et al. (2015).

The present manuscript comprises the first application of the TREX-QCLAS system for in-situ analysis of CH$_4$ isotopologues at a field site for an extended period of time. In comparison to the original setup, the heating power of the
polyimide foil on the cold trap was reduced to 60 W to increase its lifetime. Due to the lower heating power, the duration of the desorption step had to be extended, which led to an improved separation from residual bulk gases (e.g. N₂ and O₂). Lowering the O₂ enhancement in the gas matrix is also the main reason for a lower offset in δ¹³C of 1.58 ‰, with respect to the MPI - scale, as compared to 2.3 ‰ in previously published results (Eyer et al., 2015). The offset was related to a higher O₂ mole fraction in the gas matrix after CH₄ preconcentration. One measurement cycle consisted of four consecutive measurements of ambient air samples and one sample of pressurized air used as a target gas, followed by a calibration phase and took around 4:30 hours. This translates into an analysis time of 54 minutes per sample of ambient or pressurized air.

A calibration gas (CG1, (1200 ± 50) µmol/mol CH₄, δ¹³C = -(44.24 ± 0.10) ‰, δD = -(104.7 ± 1.1) ‰) was diluted to 688 µmol/mol and analyzed between every preconcentrated sample as an anchor to correct the measurements for instrumental drift. A second calibration gas (CG2, (1103.8 ± 3.5) µmol/mol CH₄, δ¹³C = -(36.13 ± 0.10) ‰, δD = -(180.6 ± 1.1) ‰), diluted to a similar CH₄ mole fraction of 681 µmol/mol was used to calculate calibration factors for δ¹³C and δD values. Furthermore, gas cylinders of pressurized ambient air, referred to as target gas (TG1, TG2), were frequently measured over the entire campaign to determine and verify the repeatability of the measurement system, which was found to be 0.28 ‰ and 1.7 ‰ for δ¹³C and δD (1σ), respectively. Additional adjustments in the preconcentration procedure and in the analytical routine for isotope analysis improved the repeatability to 0.18 ‰ and 0.85 ‰ for δ¹³C and δD in the last month of the campaign. One example is the improved temperature control of the trap during adsorption, which in turn stabilized the O₂ content in the measuring gas and thereby reduced variations in δ¹³C-CH₄.

The CH₄ isotopic composition of the calibration gases, as well as the target gases (TG1, (2639.5 ± 0.6) nmol/mol CH₄, δ¹³C = -(46.48 ± 0.10) ‰, δD = -(119.0 ± 1.1) ‰, TG2, (2659.8 ± 0.6) nmol/mol CH₄, δ¹³C = -(45.87 ± 0.10) ‰, δD = -(114.1 ± 1.1) ‰) were determined by the Stable Isotope Laboratory at the Max-Planck-Institute for Biogeochemistry. CH₄ mole fraction measurements were linked to
the WMO-X2004 calibration scale (Dlugokencky et al., 2005) through calibration of the target gases against NOAA reference standards at Empa.

2.5. Modeling

Two complementary atmospheric transport models (TM5, FLEXPART-COSMO), both in combination with two different emissions inventories (TNO-MACC_2, EDGAR/LPJ-WhyMe), were applied to support interpretation of the measurements. The Eularian tracer model TM5 simulated the distribution of CH₄ and ¹³CH₄ at global scale with a zoom on Europe at 1° x 1° resolution and considered both the isotopic signatures of different sources and the fractionation by different removal pathways of CH₄ in the atmosphere. The Lagrangian particle dispersion model FLEXPART-COSMO, conversely, was run in backward mode at a higher resolution of 0.06° x 0.06° but only over Europe. This model is better able to represent the spatial variability of CH₄ sources in the near field of Cabauw but it only simulated the contributions from the last 4 days of emissions within Europe and not the large-scale background. Chemical loss of CH₄ was not considered due to the short transport times between the sources and the receptor point at Cabauw. δD was only simulated with FLEXPART-COSMO.

2.5.1. TM5 modeling

Simulations of atmospheric CH₄ and δ¹³C were performed using the global tracer model TM5 (Krol et al., 2005). The Eularian off-line model was driven by meteorological fields from the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) reanalysis project ERA-Interim (Dee et al., 2011), pre-processed for use in TM5. For vertical transport due to moist convection we made use of Era Interim archived convective mass fluxes, replacing the use of the Tiedke scheme in Krol et al. (2005). The model was run at a horizontal resolution of 6°x4° globally and 1°x1° inside a zoom domain covering Western Europe. The model uses 25 hybrid sigma-pressure levels from the surface to top of atmosphere.

Two parallel (forward) TM5 simulations were performed with CH₄ and ¹³CH₄ as transported tracers. In the standard configuration, anthropogenic CH₄ emissions were taken from EDGAR4.2 FT2010 (EDGAR, 2009), extrapolated to 2014 and
2015 using annual statistics from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the British Petroleum Company (BP), as described in Houweling et al. (2014). For natural wetland emissions, an average of the emission estimates derived by Spahni et al. (2011) for the period 2003-2008 was taken, using the LPJ-WhyMe model. For a complete description of the CH$_4$ emissions (Table 1), see Monteil et al. (2013) and references therein. $^{13}$CH$_4$ emissions were derived from the CH$_4$ emissions using prescribed $\delta^{13}$C source signatures (Table 1). The emission inventory was built according to a double constraint: 1$^{st}$, each source signature must be chosen within its own uncertainty interval, and 2$^{nd}$, the resulting global average source signature must be compatible with the global source signature that is inferred from the observations (and that is known with a much better precision than the individual source signatures) (Monteil et al., 2011). In a second set of simulations, anthropogenic emissions in a regional domain centered on Cabauw were replaced by emissions from the European TNO-MACC_2 inventory, which was used as the standard inventory in the FLEXPART-COSMO simulations (see below). Outside the regional domain covered by TNO-MACC_2, the EDGAR emissions were used.

Atmospheric removal of CH$_4$ was modeled as described in Monteil et al. (2013), using kinetic fractionation factors $\alpha = k(^{12}\text{C}) / k(^{13}\text{C})$ of $\alpha_{\text{OH}} = 1.0055$, $\alpha_{\text{Cl}} = 1.066$ and $\alpha_{\text{O(1D)}} = 1.013$ for the reactions between CH$_4$ and OH (Sander et al., 2006), Cl (Saueressig et al., 1995) and O($^1\text{D}$) (Saueressig et al., 2000), respectively. The simulations were initialized at steady state (obtained via a spin-up run) in 2005, and simulations of the period 2005-2015 were used to calculate a realistic state of the atmosphere at the start of the measurement campaigns, including the imbalance between emissions and atmospheric CH$_4$ mixing ratio/isotopic composition in 2014. Time series were extracted from model-simulated mole fraction fields after interpolation to the horizontal coordinate and height of the Cabauw tower air inlet.

2.5.2. FLEXPART-COSMO modeling
The Lagrangian Particle Dispersion Model (LPDM) FLEXPART (Stohl et al., 2005) was used in a modified version coupled to the mesoscale numerical weather
forecast model COSMO (Baldauf et al., 2011) to simulate the regional contribution of different source categories to the concentrations and isotopic signatures of CH$_4$ at Cabauw. FLEXPART–COSMO was driven by hourly operational analysis fields generated by the Swiss national weather service MeteoSwiss for a domain covering entire western and central Europe from Ireland, Denmark, and Poland in the north to Portugal and southern Italy in the south with a horizontal resolution of approximately 7 km x 7 km and 60 vertical levels. Every 3 hours, 50'000 particles (air parcels) were released from the position of the inlet 20 m above surface and traced backward in time for 4 days to compute the sensitivity of each 3-hourly measurement to upwind sources. The corresponding source sensitivity maps or footprints (Seibert and Frank, 2004) were multiplied with gridded CH$_4$ emissions to compute the mole fraction enhancement above background expected from different sources. Emissions were taken from the TNO-MACC$_2$ inventory for Europe representative of the year 2009 and available at 0.125° x 0.0625° resolution (Kuenen et al., 2014) or, alternatively, from the same version of EDGAR/LPJ-WhyMe inventory driving TM5 at a resolution of 1° x 1°. Methane mole fractions were computed separately for a number of SNAP (Standardized Nomenclature for Air Pollutants) source categories with specific isotopic signatures as summarized in Table 2.

For the domain covered by the FLEXPART-COSMO simulations, which includes most of western and central Europe, total anthropogenic emissions are 20.6 Tg CH$_4$/yr in EDGAR and 18.3 Tg CH$_4$/yr in TNO-MACC, which corresponds to a difference of 12.5%. CH$_4$ emissions from gas/oil production and distribution are 89% higher, CH$_4$ emissions from agriculture 19% lower and CH$_4$ emissions from waste 12% higher in EDGAR than in TNO-MACC.

Source specific emissions were combined with isotopic signatures of the various categories from Table 2 to derive mean $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D isotopic signatures for the CH$_4$ that was picked up by the air parcel along the trajectory.

2.6. Interpretation of CH$_4$ isotope data

2.6.1. Data analysis by a Keeling plot technique
The isotopic composition of CH₄ emissions were estimated using the Keeling plot technique (Keeling, 1961; Pataki et al., 2003). This method allows the isotopic signature of a single source process or the mean isotopic signature of combined source processes that mix into a background reservoir to be determined from the observed ambient isotopic composition and mole fraction. An implicit assumption of the Keeling plot approach is that the isotopic composition and mole fraction of the background reservoir and the isotopic composition of the source or the combined source stay constant over the time range of the analysis. This may not always apply as the relative contribution of individual CH₄ sources or their isotopic signature may change over time.

To exploit the high temporal resolution of our data, we applied a novel approach of a moving Keeling plot (MKP) method. Data within a moving window of 12 hours were used to calculate the source isotopic composition. This window was moved in 1-hour time steps over the data series. In addition, values for background conditions within a 48-hour period, centered on the respective 12-hour window, were included in the analysis. These background values were chosen between 10:00 and 18:00 local time, because during this period a convective boundary layer usually develops and hence local influence is weak; pollution events with CH₄ mole fractions above 2100 nmol/mol were filtered out additionally. For each time window, an orthogonal least squares fit was applied to the δ values vs. the inverse CH₄ mole fractions and R² values were calculated. A Keeling plot analysis only returns meaningful values for the source isotopic composition if the variations in CH₄ mole fraction are significant and if the emissions are from a source with a well-defined isotopic composition. Therefore, two additional filters were applied: i) the mole fraction had to vary by more than 200 nmol/mol within each time window and ii) the R² of the fit had to be larger than 0.8. If R² < 0.8, the 12 h interval was reduced consecutively by one hour to a minimum of six hours until either the R² of the fit was > 0.8 or the number of data points was lower than five. On average this technique accumulated 22 data points per 12-h time window.

3. Results

3.1. Overview of the field measurements at the Cabauw site
The full record of the methane mole fraction and isotopic composition obtained with the two measurement techniques at the CESAR site is shown in Fig. 2. The IRMS system started with δD measurements first, and after 3 weeks delivered both δ^{13}C and δD data. The TREX-QCLAS system started later and ran continuously from mid-December to mid-January, and from mid-February to the end of the campaign. Despite a number of interruptions mainly due to various kinds of instrument malfunction, the combined time series of both techniques shows a high temporal coverage with more than 2500 measurements performed for both δ^{13}C and δD.

A qualitative inspection of the time series already conveys the obvious features that will be discussed below in more detail: the methane mole fraction χ(CH₄) shows a large number of substantial increases above background level, and these positive methane excursions are accompanied by negative excursions in the δ values from the background level. Thus the additional methane is generally depleted in both ^{13}C and D.

3.2. Inter-comparison of the two analytical techniques

Before presenting a detailed analysis of the CH₄ isotopic composition in ambient air, we compare the results obtained with the IRMS and QCLAS techniques in order to evaluate their performance and to combine the results into one final dataset. Although both systems measured air from the same intake line, the sampling intervals could not be synchronized since both instruments operated in different measurement cycles. A full measurement cycle (including measurement of the reference gas) took 84 minutes for the IRMS system and 54 minutes for the TREX-QCLAS system. The actual duration of the air sampling was 10 minutes for the IRMS system and 15 minutes for the QCLAS system. So even if the systems coincidentally started sampling at the same time, they never actually analyzed exactly the same air mass. Consequently, differences between the systems contain contributions from natural variability, random fluctuations due to limited measurement precision, and system offsets.

Fig. 3 shows a comparison of the χ(CH₄), as well as δ^{13}C and δD values that were obtained with the TREX-QCLAS and the IRMS technique. To visualize the possible effect of time shifts, the size of the points corresponds to the proximity of the
sampling intervals. A total of 727, 333 and 277 measurement pairs for $\chi$(CH₄),
$\delta^{13}$C and $\delta^D$, respectively, analyzed by both techniques were combined in this
way.

The mole fraction comparison shows good agreement along the 1:1 line but with
a large scatter, which has two contributions: i) instrumental noise, as the isotope
systems have a relatively large uncertainty for measurement of the mole fraction
compared to existing high-precision CH₄ analyzers, and ii) natural variability
associated with the sampling of different air masses as described above. The
second point is supported by the fact that the average difference in CH₄ mole
fractions between the two analytical techniques was larger for larger temporal
differences in the sampling intervals.

For the isotope intercalibration plots, the grey-black shading of the circles
indicates the difference in $\chi$(CH₄) of the respective measurement pair analyzed
by both techniques. The overall difference between the measurements
conducted with the two systems (QCLAS-IRMS) is (+0.25 ± 0.04) ‰ for $\delta^{13}$C and
(-4.3 ± 0.4) ‰ for $\delta^D$ (the stated errors are standard errors of the mean). The
mean offsets are slightly outside the WMO extended compatibility goals for $\delta^{13}$C
(0.2 ‰) and within the WMO extended compatibility goals for $\delta^D$ (5 ‰), as
indicated by the red dashed lines (WMO, 2014). Individual measurement pairs
can show significantly larger deviations for aforementioned reasons. Differences
between the two techniques are higher than expected as both laboratories refer
their measurements to MPI-BGC, who recently established a link between the
CH₄ isotopic composition and the international reference materials VPDB and
VSMOW, in the framework of the INGOS project (Sperlich et al., 2016). Therefore,
remaining differences can only be rationalized by uncertainties in propagating
the scale or by instrumental issues. The enhanced discrepancies for low $\delta^D$-CH₄
values might originate from a non-linear response of one of the applied
analytical techniques. The mean offset values determined above were applied to
the QCLAS data to create one combined dataset with 2610 data points for $\delta^{13}$C
and 2673 data points for $\delta^D$.

3.3. FLEXPART-COSMO source attribution
In FLEXPART-COSMO, the contributions of the individual source types are simulated separately and added up to obtain the cumulative CH$_4$ mole fraction. Fig. 4 shows these contributions in absolute (top) and relative terms (bottom). According to the model, the relative contributions at the Cabauw site are quite uniform, with agricultural sources accounting for more than 60%, waste (mostly landfills) around 20–40%, and fossil sources between 0 and 40%. We note that significant contributions from fossil sources are only detected episodically, during several events that usually last a few days. Contributions from other source categories are generally negligible at the Cabauw site.

### 3.4. TM5 and FLEXPART-COSMO modeling including isotopes

The TM5 model calculates the combined influence of the global methane sources and sinks on CH$_4$ and $\delta^{13}$C at the Cabauw tower, and therefore the TM5 results can be compared directly to the measured time series. For FLEXPART-COSMO, a representative background mole fraction and isotopic signature needs to be added for comparison with the observations. For simplicity we assumed a constant background similar to the observed values for background conditions: 1930 nmol/mol for $\chi$(CH$_4$) with $\delta^{13}$C = -47.1 ‰ and $\delta$D = -86 ‰.

Fig. 5 shows a comparison of these model-generated time series with the measured data for the entire campaign. Both models capture the amplitude and the temporal variability of $\chi$(CH$_4$) well. Most of the methane pollution events observed at the CESAR site are also present in the modeled time series and the increase in $\chi$(CH$_4$) is of a comparable size. In addition, the results of the TM5 and the FLEXPART-COSMO model for CH$_4$ mole fractions agree relatively well with each other (R$^2$=0.69), in particular when both models are run with the same inventory at the same coarse spatial resolution, i.e. with EDGAR/LPJ-WhyMe.

A few pronounced CH$_4$ events in Fig. 5 show larger differences between the models. On 2 November, FLEXPART-COSMO simulates an emission signal that is not captured by TM5. Unfortunately no measurements are available for this event to decide on which model performs better. On 30 November TM5 simulates a CH$_4$ plume, which is absent in FLEXPART-COSMO, and this event is also not supported by the measurements. The global model has the advantage...
that it includes the influence of long-range transport. As expected, however, the observed variability is predominantly influenced by local and regional emissions.

Regarding the time series of the $\delta$ values, both TM5 and FLEXPART-COSMO qualitatively display the expected anti-correlations between CH$_4$ and $\delta^{13}$C. However, the amplitude of the $\delta^{13}$C variability is generally underestimated in the model runs, especially when using the EDGAR inventory. In addition, the modeled background level of $\delta^{13}$C in TM5 is offset by up to 1 %, but this offset is also present at clean background sites in the Northern hemisphere.

Using the TNO-MACC inventory in FLEXPART-COSMO results in better agreement with the observed variability of $\delta^{13}$C. In TM5, the TNO-MACC emissions reduce the amplitude of the CH$_4$ variability, which is explained by the 13% lower emissions in TNO-MACC compared with EDGAR. Furthermore, the results of both models are consistent with the emissions being more depleted in $\delta^{13}$C in TNO-MACC than in EDGAR. The measurements indicate emissions that are even more depleted in $\delta^{13}$C than TNO-MACC values. These results suggest that the fractional contribution of isotopically heavy fossil emissions is overestimated in EDGAR, at least in the area sampled by Cabauw, although the uncertainty in the assumed $\delta^{13}$C source signatures could also contribute. For instance, recent literature showed that landfill emissions from the UK are more depleted in $^{13}$CH$_4$ due to the implementation of gas extraction systems (Zazzeri et al., 2015).

The $\delta$D time series simulated with FLEXPART-COSMO using the TNO-MACC inventory is in good agreement with the measurements. This further indicates that TNO-MACC has a realistic source mixture, but the uncertainties in the mean $\delta$D signature are too large to draw firm conclusions at this stage. Despite these uncertainties, Fig. 5 clearly demonstrates how isotopic measurements highlight differences between emission inventories, which would go unnoticed looking only at CH$_4$ mole fractions. Additional information may be available from the combination of both isotope signatures. For several of the CH$_4$ elevation events shown in Fig. 5b, the relative changes in $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D modeled with FLEXPART-COSMO vary when using the two different inventories (TNO-MACC and EDGAR). Some of the anomalies show differences pointing in the same direction for $\delta^{13}$C
and δD, and some others not. This suggests that δD provides additional independent information, which will be discussed in more detail in Section 4.3 using a double isotope plot of the source signatures (Fig. 7). The benefit of the high-resolution dual isotope measurements for validating emissions used in the models will be investigated in Section 4.4.

4. Discussion

4.1. Diurnal and synoptic variability

A prominent feature of the high-resolution dataset is the pronounced diurnal variability, with large increases in CH₄ mole fraction that occur often during the night, due to the shallow planetary boundary layer. In addition, there are also several synoptic (but much smaller) pollution events, where CH₄ mole fractions stay above the unpolluted background level for several days. These elevations are likely caused by synoptic scale advection of CH₄ plumes from other source regions with a different source mix.

4.2. Isotope identification of the mean CH₄ source

In Fig. 6, the Keeling plot technique is applied to identify the mean isotopic signatures (δ¹³C, δD) of the combined CH₄ emissions detected at the Cabauw site. An orthogonal regression method was applied to determine the fit parameters. This analysis yields well-defined mean isotopic signatures of the cumulative source (the y-intercept of the regression analysis) of δ¹³C = -(60.8 ± 0.2) ‰ and δD = -(298 ± 1) ‰. The inferred mean isotopic signature agrees well with emission from ruminants, which are expected to be the main source of CH₄ in this rural area. This is plausible, because the mean isotopic signature is largely determined by the pronounced nighttime CH₄ elevations, which represent the local emissions close to the tower. Also the source contributions modeled by FLEXPART-COSMO suggest the dominant influence of agricultural emissions in this rural area (Fig. 4). Interestingly, the mean isotopic signature for the much smaller synoptic CH₄ variations of the background (red points in Fig. 6) is not significantly different from the one for the complete dataset.

4.3. Short-term variability
Given the high temporal resolution of the dataset presented here, the isotope variations can be interpreted in much more detail than the overall analysis performed above. This allows identifying varying contributions of CH₄ sources during different periods of the campaign. To do so, we applied a 12-hour Moving Keeling Plot (MKP) method to the data, as described in Sect 2.6.1.

Fig. 7 summarizes the results of the MKP method in the form of a δD vs. δ¹³C plot. To combine δ¹³C and δD measurements performed at different times, MKP intercepts were averaged over 6 h intervals. Mean δ¹³C signatures range between -68 ‰ and -55 ‰ and mean δD signatures cover a relatively wide range between -350 ‰ and -260 ‰, indicating emissions mainly from microbial sources as derived from the cumulative Keeling plot analysis. During some periods, however, elevated mean δ¹³C and δD signatures reveal significant additional contributions from waste and/or fossil emissions.

The colored symbols in Fig. 7 highlight the mean isotopic signatures of three 48 h events (10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 March) that are discussed in more detail in the following. For the event of 16-18 March, selected results of the 12 h MKP method are displayed in Fig. 8, demonstrating the advantage of the high temporal resolution data. It is possible to clearly distinguish variations in the mean isotopic signatures during this event by variations in the y-axis intercepts. The increase by about 6 ‰ for δ¹³C and about 50 ‰ for δD, in the source isotopic signature for this event, clearly indicates the gradually increasing contribution of CH₄ from isotopically enriched sources, e.g. fossil fuel- or waste-related CH₄.

The temporal evolution of the observed source mixture is investigated in further detail in Fig. 9, where the 16-18 March period (labeled as 2) is compared to two other 48 h – periods (10-12 March; label 1, and 22-24 March; label 3), each with significant diurnal CH₄ elevations. For event 1, the mean isotopic signatures stayed rather constant at values around δ¹³C = -63 ‰ and δD = -320 ‰. These values are typical for microbial emissions from an agricultural source and agree well with the source contributions predicted for this period by the FLEXPART-COSMO model.

Period 2 is characterized by much stronger isotopic change within the 48 h period. The δ¹³C signature increases to above -60 ‰ and the δD signature
increases to -240 ‰ by the end of the period (see Fig. 9). The double-isotope plot in Fig. 7 shows that the change in δD during event 2b clearly points towards fossil fuel sources, which provides independent support for the FLEXPART-COSMO simulations, where the contributions from fossil-fuel-derived emissions are higher for the second day.

For period 3, the mean δ¹³C isotopic signatures increased during the 48 h by about 2-3 ‰, whereas the δD signatures remained constant around -300 ‰. For this period, the double isotope plot of Fig. 7 indeed shows a shift towards the waste category. Also this observation is independently confirmed (at least qualitatively) by the FLEXPART-COSMO model derived source attribution, which indicates the largest fraction of waste-derived CH₄ for the first day and a small addition of fossil CH₄ for the second day of event 3. These examples show that even at a location like Cabauw, where one source category strongly dominates, contributions from isotopically different sources can be identified if sufficiently high-resolution dual isotope ratio data are available. We note that the "directional" information in the double isotope plot is only available by combining δ¹³C and δD measurements. It would be much harder, if not impossible, to detect an addition from fossil fuel- or landfill-derived CH₄ based on δ¹³C or δD data alone.

4.4. Evaluation of emission databases with high temporal resolution CH₄ isotope data

As described in Section 3.4, both the TM5 and the FLEXPART-COSMO model-generated time series of CH₄ mole fractions show an adequate agreement with the CH₄ measurements at the Cabauw site. Therefore, the comparison between measurement data and the models can be used to evaluate the methane budget in more detail. In this context, the measured and modeled isotopic composition can be employed to assess the validity of emission inventories, EDGAR and TNO-MACC, with respect to the magnitude and spatial distribution of source categories. To compare the measured mean isotopic signatures to the model results, the simulated isotope time series were linearly interpolated and evaluated in the same way as the observations using the 12 h MKP method. This analysis was performed for both models (TM5 and FLEXPART-COSMO), each
using both the EDGAR/LPJ-Why-Me and the TNO_MACC inventories. Additionally, time series for the mean isotopic signatures were calculated directly from FLEXPART-COSMO data, without using of the MKP method. This direct method allowed an independent estimation of the mean isotopic signatures and, thus, also provided an opportunity to evaluate the MKP method.

The statistics of the mean isotopic signatures from all four model-inventory combinations are shown as histograms in Fig. 10, together with the measurement-derived mean isotopic signatures and the directly derived signatures from FLEXPART-COSMO modeling. A clear difference can be observed between the mean isotopic signatures derived with the two different emission inventories. Model runs with the EDGAR/LPJ-WhyMe emission inventory (red in Fig. 10) tend to produce mean CH$_4$ isotopic signatures that are more enriched in $^{13}$C and D than the model runs with TNO-MACC emissions. These differences are very similar for the simulations using TM5 and FLEXPART-COSMO, suggesting that differences originate from the emission inventories, rather than from differences between the models themselves. The $\delta^{13}$C source signatures derived from the measurements at the Cabauw tower are significantly more depleted than any of the model-generated datasets. For $\delta$D, the mean isotopic signatures using TNO-MACC emissions are relatively close to the measurements at Cabauw, whereas the values using EDGAR emissions are much more enriched in CH$_3$D.

The high temporal resolution isotope data that are described in this paper thus provide relevant information to further constrain models and/or emission inventories, because the mean isotopic signatures can change rapidly. The comparison of our first high-resolution isotope measurements at Cabauw to model calculations clearly identify differences between the modeled inventories, where the EDGAR inventory produced too enriched mean isotopic signatures due to a higher contribution from fossil fuel sources. Similar differences in terms of source contributions between EDGAR and TNO-MACC$_2$ were also reported by Hiller et al. (2014) for Switzerland, and Henne et al. (2015) concluded that natural gas emissions in Switzerland are likely overestimated in EDGAR.

5. Conclusions and outlook
The dual isotopic composition of CH₄ has been monitored for the first time with high temporal resolution in an extended (5 months) field deployment with two different instruments, an IRMS system and a QCLAS system, at the tall tower site Cabauw, the Netherlands. The measurements of both instruments compare well and can be combined to a time series of more than 2500 measurements for both δ¹³C and δD. Using a moving Keeling plot technique, the mean isotopic signatures of periods with significant CH₄ elevations can be derived with high temporal resolution. The combination of δ¹³C and δD data provides strong constraints to distinguish emissions from different source categories. Overall, CH₄ emissions at the Cabauw tall tower are dominated by agricultural sources, but variations in the mean isotopic signatures allow identification of events with increased contributions from fossil fuel and waste sources, which can be used to validate variations in the source mix, calculated using the FLEXPART-COSMO model.

The high-resolution isotope ratio measurements at Cabauw were compared to model calculations that used two different emission inventories. When two very different models (TM5 and FLEXPART-COSMO) used emissions from the EDGAR inventory, they produced clearly too enriched mean isotopic signatures. The modeled mean isotopic signatures were systematically more depleted and closer to the measured ones when the TNO-MACC inventory was used. The differences in the source signatures appear to originate from differences in the inventories and not from differences in the models, which supports indications in the recent literature that fossil fuel related emissions might be overestimated in EDGAR. We note that measurements at Cabauw reflect only one limited region of the European domain, and given the many degrees of freedom (transport, source signatures used in the models, emission inventories), one single dataset is not sufficient to make a final decision on the quality of the emission dataset. High frequency analysis of δ¹³C- and δD at several locations would allow better constraints on isotope source signatures and emissions in atmospheric models. Our proof-of-concept study presented here using continuous high-resolution techniques shows that this will be feasible in the future.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Yearly emissions (Europe, Tg CH₄/yr)</th>
<th>source signature δ¹³C/‰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural wetlands (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Peatland</em></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wet mineral soils</em></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inundated wetlands</em></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological emissions (2)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termites (3)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anthropogenic emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass burning (4)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Domestic ruminants</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manure</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rice paddies</em></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy sector (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coal mining</em></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oil production</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gas production and distribution</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oil combustion</em></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential sector (5)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste treatment (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Landfills</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Waste waters</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>-54.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Spahni et al. (2011); (2) Etiope et al. (2008); (3) Sanderson et al. (1996); (4) GFED3/4 (http://www.globalfiredata.org/); (5) EDGAR4.2FT (EDGAR, 2010).
Table 2 SNAP (Standardized Nomenclature for Air Pollutants) source categories and corresponding δ¹³C and δD source signatures from the TNO-MACC_2 inventory as used in FLEXPART-COSMO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAP Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>δ¹³C/‰</th>
<th>δD/‰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Energy industries, oil or gas production</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential combustion</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+4</td>
<td>Industrial combustion and non-combustion processes</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extraction and distribution of fossil fuels including distribution of natural gas</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Road transport</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Waste including emissions from landfills</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Agriculture including emissions from ruminants and manure management</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>-319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+8</td>
<td>Other emissions (negligible)</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Mean value and standard deviation of the histograms of the source isotopic composition shown in Fig. 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model + Inventory</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$\delta^{13}C/%o$</th>
<th>$\delta D/%o$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement data</td>
<td>MKP</td>
<td>-61.0 ± 2.8</td>
<td>-300 ± 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM5 + Edgar</td>
<td>MKP</td>
<td>-53.3 ± 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXPART-COSMO + Edgar</td>
<td>MKP</td>
<td>-54.5 ± 1.6</td>
<td>-277 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXPART-COSMO + Edgar</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>-53.4 ± 1.7</td>
<td>-269 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM5 + TNO-MACC</td>
<td>MKP</td>
<td>-56.7 ± 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXPART-COSMO + TNO-MACC</td>
<td>MKP</td>
<td>-57.6 ± 1.9</td>
<td>-294 ± 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXPART-COSMO + TNO-MACC</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>-57.2 ± 1.7</td>
<td>-289 ± 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1: Schematics of the pre-concentration and extraction system developed for the IRMS technique. MFC denotes mass flow controller. The 8-port valve through which the Ref air bottle was connected to the first selection valve is not shown to reduce complexity. For further description see the main text.
Fig. 2: CH₄ mole fraction, χ(CH₄), and isotopic composition (δ¹³C, δD) measured at the Cabauw tall tower from 17 October 2014 until 29 March 2015. Real-time measurements by IRMS (Utrecht University) are indicated in yellow, TREX-QCLAS (Empa) data in blue.
Fig. 3: Correlation diagrams for CH$_4$ mole fraction, $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D analyzed with IRMS (Utrecht University) and TREX-QCLAS (Empa). The dashed black lines are 1:1 lines, dashed red lines mark the extended WMO compatibility goals of ± 5 nmol/mol, ± 0.2 ‰ and ± 5 ‰ for CH$_4$ mole fraction, $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D, respectively. The temporal difference between IRMS and TREX-QCLAS sampling is indicated by the point size (large: 20 min, medium: 40 min, small: 60 min). For $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D, the differences in the CH$_4$ mole fraction of the measurements are represented by the shading (black: identical mole fractions, white: 50 nmol/mol difference).
Fig. 4: Absolute (top) and relative (bottom) contributions of methane emissions that are picked up along the 4-day FLEXPART-COSMO trajectories during the campaign. The results shown are from the FLEXPART-COSMO simulations with the TNO-MACC inventory. They indicate major contributions of the following source categories: “agriculture” (mainly ruminants), “waste” (mainly landfills) and “fossil” (fugitive losses from coal, oil and natural gas production and from gas transportation and distribution) to the increase in CH$_4$ mole fractions at Cabauw. The category “rest” primarily represents residential CH$_4$ emissions.
Fig. 5: Comparison of the modeled and measured time series of CH₄ mole fraction and isotopic composition (δ¹³C- and δD). Measurements are shown as circles and model results as lines. Top graph: two selected model configurations for the entire campaign: FLEXPART-COSMO using the TNO-MACC inventory (blue) and TM5 using the Edgar/Why-Me inventory (red). Bottom graph: Time series for March 2015 with all four model – inventory combinations. For δD, only the synthetic FLEXPART-COSMO results are available for comparison since TM5 does not simulate δD.
Fig. 6: Keeling plot of all data using an orthogonal regression method. The dashed line indicates the regression line and the shaded area the confidence interval taking into account the measurement uncertainties. The color code indicates all measured data (grey points) and daily background values (red points). Left panels show the region near the y-axis intercept.
Fig. 7: MKP intercepts of δD vs. δ¹³C. The colored areas indicate typical isotope signatures for different source categories. Circles show the 6h-averaged source signatures. Large colored symbols indicate data from the three events (event 1: 10th – 12th March, event 2: 16th – 18th March, event 3: 22nd to 24th March) that are highlighted in Fig. 9. The labels a and b refer to day 1 and day 2 of the two-day events, respectively. For the source signatures, the δ¹³C values are taken from Table 1 and the δD values from recent literature (Snover et al., 2000; Rigby et al., 2012).
Fig. 8: Keeling plots for the period between 16 and 18 March, illustrating a rapid change in δ values over the course of hours, which is most probably related to a change from mainly ruminant derived CH₄ to a significant contribution of fossil and/or waste CH₄. The dashed lines indicate the regression line, the shaded areas show the uncertainty (one standard deviation) of the regression line. Left panels show the region near the y-axis intercept. Times indicated are Central European Time (CET).
Fig. 9: Detailed analysis of three 2-day periods with large CH$_4$ elevations in March 2015. The top panel exhibits CH$_4$ mole fraction (grey) with background values in red (10:00-18:00, >2100 nmol/mol). The middle panels show the mean isotopic signatures ($\delta^{13}$C, $\delta$D) derived with the 12-h MKP method. The color-coding in the middle panels (red, light blue, purple) indicates characteristic contributions from different sources; red-microbial, light blue-fossil, purple-waste. For consistency, the same color-coding was chosen in Fig. 7. The bottom graph presents CH$_4$ source contributions as computed with the FLEXPART-COSMO model using the TNO-MACC inventory, averaged over 24 hours.
Fig. 10: Histograms of CH₄ isotope source signatures at the CESAR site between October 2014 and March 2015. Bin widths are 1 ‰ for δ¹³C and 10 ‰ for δD. Mean isotopic signatures are derived from measured data (grey bins), FLEXPART-COSMO modeling (squares) as well as TM5 modeling (circles) using the 12 h MKP method. Two different inventories, TNO-MACC (blue) and
Edgar/LPJ-Why-Me (red), were used. The shaded areas show histograms for the “direct” source signatures that were picked up along the FLEXPART-COSMO trajectory (right axis).
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